m.f

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,437	04/02/2001	Jeffrey J. Chin	24176-703	1808

7590 09/06/2006

FABIO E. MARINO
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER	
WOZNIAK, JAMES S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/825,437	CHIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James S. Wozniak	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-270* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *57-149 and 206-270* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33,35-56,150-182 and 184-205* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *34 and 183* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. **Claims 57-149 and 206-270** are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 5/25/2005.

Specification

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

3. **Claim 56** is objected to because of the following informalities:

In Claim 56, Line 2, "to the inputting user" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claim 9** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 9, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. **Claims 13-14, 47-51, 162-163, and 196-200** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 13 and 162 recite a step for unifying hiragana and katakana in Japanese language inputs. Although the specification discloses a typing aid for Japanese text inputs (specification, page 41), there is no mention of unifying hiragana and katakana.

Further, the specification provides no disclosure that indicates the meaning of "unifying" or how unifying hiragana and katakana can be performed. Thus, since the specification makes no mention of unifying hiragana and katakana nor discloses the meaning of "unifying," Claim 13 fails to comply with the written description requirement. The examiner has interpreted "unifying" as any type of general grouping process for the application of the prior art of record.

Claims 14 and 163 recite a step for unifying small and large kana in Japanese language inputs. Although the specification discloses a typing aid for Japanese text inputs (specification, page 41), there is no mention of unifying small and large kana. Further, the specification provides no disclosure that indicates the meaning of "unifying" or how unifying small and large kana can be performed. Thus, since the specification makes no mention of unifying small and large kana nor discloses the meaning of "unifying," Claim 14 fails to comply with the written description requirement. The examiner has interpreted "unifying" as any type of general grouping process for the application of the prior art of record.

Claims 47-48 and 196-197 recite a step for randomly assigning a very large integer to a non-translating text input portion. Although the specification discloses assigning special characters to a non-translating text input portion (specification, page 42), there is no mention that these special characters refer to very large integers. Further, the specification provides no disclosure that indicates how the very large integers are randomly generated. Thus, since the specification makes no mention of

randomly assigning a very large integer to a non-translating text input portion, Claims 47-48 fail to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 49-51 and 198-200 recite a step for randomly assigning an alphanumeric string to a non-translating text input portion. Although the specification discloses assigning special characters to a non-translating text input portion (specification, page 42), there is no mention that these special characters refer to alphanumeric strings. Further, the specification provides no disclosure that indicates how the alphanumeric strings are randomly generated. The disclosure also fails to teach the concatenation of an alphanumeric string to a sequentially generated character or integer, as is additionally recited in claims 51-52, respectively. Thus, since the specification makes no mention of randomly assigning an alphanumeric character to a non-translating text input portion, Claims 49-51 fail to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. **Claims 1-2, 52-53, 56, 150-151, 201-202, and 205** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayakawa et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,119,078)*.

With respect to **Claims 1 and 150**, Kobayakawa discloses:

Providing an electronic language translator *(automatic translation engine, Col. 9, Lines 1-20)*;

Receiving source language text as an input of the electronic language translator *(Col. 9, Lines 1-20)*;

Translating the source language text at the electronic language translator into one or more target language texts *(translating foreign language text into native language text at a translation engine, Col. 9, Lines 1-20)*; and

Providing a first user with an option of viewing one or more of the target language texts with or without the source language texts *(translation display modes, Col. 12, Lines 34-42)*.

With respect to **Claims 2 and 151**, Kobayakawa discloses:

The electronic language translator includes at least a first translation engine *(translation engine for a plurality of different environments, Col. 9, Lines 1-20)*.

With respect to **Claims 52 and 201**, Kobayakawa discloses:

The electronic language translator uses specialized dictionaries to maximize the quality of the translation *(dictionary database that contains multiple specialized dictionaries, Col. 2, Lines 31-46; and Col. 5, Lines 26-34)*.

With respect to **Claims 53 and 202**, Kobayakawa discloses:

The specialized dictionaries are selected from topic-specific *(art dictionary, Col. 5, Lines 35-44)* application-specific *(Internet dictionary, Col. 5, Lines 35-44)* and user-specific dictionaries *(dictionary database prepared using user habits and preferences, Col. 6, Lines 1-9)*.

With respect to **Claims 56 and 205**, Kobayakawa discloses:

The electronic language translator provides a mechanism for viewers of the translate output to indicate when the translation has not been understood *(Col. 6, Lines 44-48)*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 3 and 152** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*.

With respect to **Claims 3 and 152**, Kobayakawa discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, as applied to Claim 1. Although Kobayakawa recites the use of a cache memory *(Col. 7, Lines 11-23)*, Kobayakawa does not specifically suggest that a language translator uses

such a cache memory. Hirai, however, recites a language translator that utilizes a cache memory for storing previously translated text portions *(Col. 5, Lines 17-28)*.

Kobayakawa and Hirai are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa with the language translation cache storing previously translated text portions as taught by Hirai in order to shorten translation time *(Hirai, Col. 1, Lines 63-67)*.

12. **Claims 4-5 and 153-154** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al, and yet further in view of Nii *(U.S. Patent: 5,659,765)*.

With respect to **Claims 4 and 153**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes and utilizes a translation cache memory, as applied to Claim 3. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai does not specifically suggest that a translation memory stores phrase and equivalents across multiple languages, however Nii discloses such a translation memory *(bilingual correspondence database comprising phrases, Col. 10, Lines 9-19)*.

Kobayakawa, Hirai, and Nii are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai with the bilingual correspondence database taught by Nii in

order to improve translation capability through past learning *results (Nii, Col. 6, Lines 13-30)*.

With respect to **Claims 5 and 154**, Hirai further discloses a means for amending cached language translation data *(Col. 5, Lines 44-57)*.

13. **Claims 6-7 and 155-156** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*, and further in view of Fukumochi et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,289,375)*.

With respect to **Claims 6 and 155**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes and utilizes a translation cache memory, as applied to Claim 3. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai does not specifically suggest enabling matching between input text and target language text entries that are not typographically identical, however Fukumochi discloses such an enabling means *(Col. 20, Lines 34-68)*.

Kobayakawa, Hirai, and Fukumochi are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai with the means for enabling matching between input text and target language text entries that are not typographically identical as taught by Fukumochi in order to correctly consult a translation dictionary for the processing of proper nouns *(Fukumochi, Col. 20, Lines 59-68)*.

With respect to **Claims 7 and 156**, Fukumochi further discloses:

Ignoring differences in the capitalization scheme *(Col. 20, Lines 34-68)*.

14. **Claims 8-9 and 157-158** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*, further in view of Fukumochi et al, and yet further in view of Schwartz *(U.S. Patent: 5,584,024)*.

With respect to **Claims 8 and 157**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, utilizes a translation cache memory, and matches input and translation text that is not typographically identical, as applied to Claim 6. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi do not specifically suggest ignoring punctuation, however Schwartz discloses such a punctuation ignoring step *(Col. 34, Lines 55-60)*.

Kobayakawa, Hirai, Fukumochi, and Schwartz are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in natural language processing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi with the punctuation ignoring step taught by Schwartz in order to provide a means for better identifying a word or phrase *(Schwartz, Col. 34, Lines 55-60)*.

With respect to **Claims 9 and 158**, Schwartz discloses tokenizing text at punctuation marks, as applied to Claim 8.

15. **Claims 10 and 159** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*, further in view of Fukumochi et al, and yet further in view of Boucher et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,884,246)*.

With respect to **Claims 10 and 159**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, utilizes a translation cache memory, and matches input and translation text that is not typographically identical, as applied to Claim 6. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi do not specifically suggest eliminating appellatives before performing translation, however Boucher discloses such a appellative removal process *(Col. 12, Lines 15-30)*.

Kobayakawa, Hirai, Fukumochi, and Boucher are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in natural language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi with the appellative removal process taught by Boucher in order to provide a means for identifying non-translatable portions *(Boucher, Col. 12, Lines 15-30)*.

16. **Claims 11 and 160** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*, further in view of Fukumochi et al, and yet further in view of Goiffon et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,453,312)*.

With respect to **Claims 11 and 160**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with

multiple translation display modes, utilizes a translation cache memory, and matches input and translation text that is not typographically identical, as applied to Claim 6. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi do not specifically suggest including a glossary containing abbreviations, slang, and other non-standard forms, however Goiffon discloses the use of such a glossary *(Col. 21, Lines 41-59)*.

Kobayakawa, Hirai, Fukumochi, and Goiffon are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in natural language processing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi with the glossary disclosed by Goiffon in order to allow a user to construct a lexicon that matches a particular regional dialect *(Goiffon, Col. 21, Lines 41-59)*.

17. **Claims 12 and 161** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*, further in view of Fukumochi et al, and yet further in view of Garneau et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,077,669)*.

With respect to **Claims 12 and 161**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, utilizes a translation cache memory, and matches input and translation text that is not typographically identical, as applied to Claim 6. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi do not specifically suggest ignoring diacritics, however Garneau discloses such a diacritics ignoring step *(Col. 6, Lines 46-58)*.

Kobayakawa, Hirai, Fukumochi, and Garneau are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in natural language processing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi with the diacritics ignoring step taught by Garneau in order to alleviate matching difficulties in text string searching *(Garneau, Col. 1, Line 61- Col. 2, Line 6).*

18. **Claims 13 and 162** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*, further in view of Fukumochi et al, and yet further in view of Ando *(U.S. Patent: 5,321,801).*

With respect to **Claims 13 and 162**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, utilizes a translation cache memory, and matches input and translation text that is not typographically identical, as applied to Claim 6. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi do not specifically suggest a hiragana and katakana unification process, however Ando teaches unifying hiragana and katakana in the form of kana-kanji conversion *(Col. 4, Lines 60-67).*

Kobayakawa, Hirai, Fukumochi, and Ando are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in natural language processing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi with the kana-kanji conversion means taught by Ando in order to more clearly indicate

an area or region to be processed in Japanese to English translation *(Ando, Col. 7, Lines 14-25)*.

19. **Claims 14 and 163** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*, further in view of Fukumochi et al, and yet further in view of Hara et al *(JP 55159245 A)*.

With respect to **Claims 14 and 163**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, utilizes a translation cache memory, and matches input and translation text that is not typographically identical, as applied to Claim 6. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi do not specifically suggest a small and large kana unification process, however Hara teaches a small *(furigana- pronunciation kana)* and large kana *(kana in a sentence)* unification process *(Constitution)*.

Kobayakawa, Hirai, Fukumochi, and Hara are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in natural language processing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi with the small and large kana unification means taught by Hara in order to enable the output of kanji and kana without increasing file capacity *(Hara, Abstract)*.

20. **Claims 15 and 164** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Hirai et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,974,371)*, further in view of Fukumochi et al, and yet further in view of Onishi et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,154,720)*.

With respect to **Claims 15 and 164**, Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, utilizes a translation cache memory, and matches input and translation text that is not typographically identical, as applied to Claim 6. Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi do not specifically suggest ignoring gobi, however Onishi discloses such a gobi ignoring step *(Col. 86, Lines 55-61)*.

Kobayakawa, Hirai, Fukumochi, and Onishi are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in natural language processing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Hirai, and further in view of Fukumochi with the gobi ignoring step taught by Hara in order to obtain a more natural English sentence from a Japanese input *(Onishi, Col. 86, Lines 55-61)*.

21. **Claims 16-17 and 165-166** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Kaji *(U.S. Patent: 5,408,410)*.

With respect to **Claims 16 and 165**, Kobayakawa discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, as applied to Claim 1. Kobayakawa does not specifically suggest the use of multiple

translation engines, however, Kaji recites the use of multiple translation systems *(Col. 14, Lines 24-46)*.

Kobayakawa and Kaji are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa with the use of multiple translation systems as taught by Kaji in order to allow a user to select a most suitable translation *(Kaji, Col. 14, Lines 24-46)*.

With respect to **Claims 17 and 166**, Kaji discloses the selection of a most suitable translation at a machine translation system *(Col. 14, Lines 24-46)*.

22. **Claims 18-20, 23-24, 167-169, and 172-173** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Berger et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,510,981)*.

With respect to **Claims 18 and 167**, Kobayakawa discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, as applied to Claim 1. Kobayakawa does not specifically suggest the use of a translation pre-processor, however, Berger discloses the use of such a translation pre-processor *(Col. 7, Lines 5-29)*.

Kobayakawa and Berger are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of

Kobayakawa with the translation pre-processor taught by Berger in order to achieve a more accurate language translation *(Berger, Col. 4, Lines 62-67)*.

With respect to **Claims 19 and 168**, Berger further teaches input text correction utilizing multiple language rules *(Col. 7, Line 5- Col. 8, Line 67)*.

With respect to **Claims 20 and 169**, Berger further teaches a spell checking means *(Col. 7, Lines 5-29)*.

With respect to **Claims 23-24 and 172-173**, Berger further teaches word form transformations as part of translation pre-processing *(Col. 7, Lines 5-29)*.

23. **Claims 21 and 170** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Berger et al, and further in view of Toma *(U.S. Patent: 4,706,212)*.

With respect to **Claims 21 and 170**, Kobayakawa in view of Berger discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes and utilizes a translation pre-processor, as applied to Claim 18. Kobayakawa in view of Berger do not specifically suggest expanding acronyms and abbreviations, however Toma recites such an expansion means *(Col. 17, Lines 36-55)*.

Kobayakawa, Berger, and Toma are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Berger with the expansion means taught by Toma in order to accomplish unambiguous translation *(Toma, Col. 3, Lines 58-59)*.

24. **Claims 22 and 171** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Berger et al, and further in view of Zamora *(U.S. Patent: 4,852,003)*.

With respect to **Claims 22 and 171**, Kobayakawa in view of Berger discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes and utilizes a translation pre-processor, as applied to Claim 18. Kobayakawa in view of Berger do not specifically suggest an accent mark correction means, however Zamora discloses such a correction means *(Col. 5, Lines 30-31)*.

Kobayakawa, Berger, and Zamora are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Berger with the correction means taught by Zamora in order to enable Romance language translation *(Zamora, Col. 4, Lines 18-22)*.

25. **Claims 25-26 and 174-175** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Berger et al, and further in view of Onishi et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,154,720)*.

With respect to **Claims 25-26 and 174-175**, Kobayakawa in view of Berger discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes and utilizes a translation pre-processor, as applied to Claim 18.

Kobayakawa in view of Berger do not specifically suggest ignoring gobi, however Onishi discloses such a gobi ignoring step *(Col. 86, Lines 55-61)*.

Kobayakawa, Berger, and Onishi are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in natural language processing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Berger with the gobi ignoring step taught by Hara in order to obtain a more natural English sentence from a Japanese input *(Onishi, Col. 86, Lines 55-61)*.

26. **Claims 27 and 176** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Murrow et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,664,206)*.

With respect to **Claims 27 and 176**, Kobayakawa discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, as applied to Claim 1. Kobayakawa does not specifically suggest use of a translation tutorial, however Murrow discloses such a translation tutorial *(guide and help files, Col. 11, Line 45- Col. 12, Line 20)*.

Kobayakawa and Murrow are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa with the translation guide taught by Murrow in order to aid a user in creating and storing a translation *(Murrow, Col. 11, Line 45- Col. 12, Line 20)*.

27. **Claims 28-31, 35, 177-180, and 184** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Brandon et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,385,568)*.

With respect to **Claims 28 and 177**, Kobayakawa discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, as applied to Claim 1. Kobayakawa does not specifically suggest a translation guiding means, however Brandon recites such a guiding means *(window-based prompting means, Col. 14, Lines 1-29)*.

Kobayakawa and Brandon are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa with the translation pre-processor taught by Berger in order to provide a means of implementing input disambiguation *(Brandon, Col. 14, Lines 1-29; and Col. 2, Lines 14-26)*.

With respect to **Claims 29, 31, 35, 178, 180, and 184** Brandon further recites a spell checker that prompts a user when an input word is not found in a database *(Col. 14, Lines 1-29)*.

With respect to **Claims 30 and 179**, Brandon further discloses proper noun identification *(Col. 14, Lines 44-67)*.

28. **Claims 32-33 and 181-182** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Brandon et al, and further in view of Weisner et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,201,042)*.

With respect to **Claims 32 and 181**, Kobayakawa in view of Brandon discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes and utilizes a translation guiding means, as applied to Claim 28. Kobayakawa in view of Brandon does not specifically suggest an input length monitor that reminds a user than shorter inputs may translate better, however Weisner discloses such a monitor *(maximum length indicator, Col. 3, Lines 46-55)*.

Kobayakawa, Brandon, and Weisner are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Brandon with the maximum length indicator taught by Weisner in order to ensure suitable language translation *(Weisner, Col. 3, Lines 46-55)*.

With respect to **Claims 33 and 182**, Weisner further discloses incrementing a character count closer to a maximum length *(Col. 3, Lines 46-55)*.

29. **Claims 36 and 185** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Brandon et al, and further in view of Berger et al.

With respect to **Claims 36 and 185**, Kobayakawa in view of Brandon discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display

modes and utilizes a translation guiding means, as applied to Claim 28. Kobayakawa in view of Brandon do not specifically suggest a syntactic construction correction means, however Berger recites a syntactic transducer capable of syntactic structure correction *(Col. 12, Line 26- Col. 14, Line 48)*.

Kobayakawa, Brandon, and Berger are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Brandon with the translation pre-processor taught by Berger in order to achieve a more accurate language translation *(Berger, Col. 4, Lines 62-67)*.

30. **Claims 37 and 186** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Brandon et al, and further in view of Zamora.

With respect to **Claims 37 and 186**, Kobayakawa in view of Brandon discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes and utilizes a translation guiding means, as applied to Claim 28. Kobayakawa in view of Brandon do not specifically suggest an accent mark correction means, however Zamora discloses such a correction means *(Col. 5, Lines 30-31)*.

Kobayakawa, Brandon, and Zamora are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the

teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Brandon with the correction means taught by Zamora in order to enable Romance language translation *(Zamora, Col. 4, Lines 18-22).*

31. **Claims 38-43 and 187-192** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Brandon et al, and further in view of Brown et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,477,451).*

With respect to **Claims 38 and 187**, Kobayakawa in view of Brandon discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes and utilizes a translation guiding means, as applied to Claim 28. Kobayakawa in view of Brandon do not specifically suggest a notification means for informing a user when a language model does not recognize an input with a desired confidence level, however Brown recites such a notification means in the form of a translation hypothesis output score display *(Col. 3, Lines 17-21).*

Kobayakawa, Brandon, and Brown are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa in view of Brandon with the translation hypothesis output score display taught by Brown in order to enable a user to define criteria in translation selection *(Brown, Col. 3, Lines 17-21).*

With respect to **Claims 39 and 188**, Brown discloses the use of a trigram language model *(Col. 29, Lines 38-53).*

With respect to **Claims 40 and 189**, Brown discloses the use of a HMM *(Col. 15, Lines 54-67)*.

With respect to **Claims 41 and 190**, Brown discloses the preparation of a partial hypothesis list *(Col. 90, Line 20- Col. 91, Line 27)*.

With respect to **Claims 42 and 191**, Brown discloses the use of a trigram language model *(Col. 29, Lines 38-53)*.

With respect to **Claims 43 and 192**, Brown discloses the use of a HMM *(Col. 15, Lines 54-67)*.

32. **Claims 44 and 193** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Suzuki et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,270,928)*.

With respect to **Claims 44 and 193**, Kobayakawa discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, as applied to Claim 1. Kobayakawa does not specifically suggest an indication means that allows a user to indicate an input portion that is not to be translated, however Suzuki discloses such an indication means *(Col. 3, Lines 47-68)*.

Kobayakawa and Suzuki are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa with the indication means taught by Suzuki in order to isolate technical terms that can obscure meaning in a sentence if translated *(Suzuki, Col. 1, Lines 27-40)*.

33. **Claims 45-51 and 194-200** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Suzuki et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,270,928)*, and further in view of official notice.

Claims 45-51 and 194-200 recite various approaches of indicating a non-translatable input portion. Although Suzuki discloses providing an indication of a non-translatable input portion through the use of a flag *(see claim 44)*, Suzuki does not teaches the various approaches of indicating a non-translatable input portion as recited in claims 45-51. The examiner, however, takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to utilize the various approaches of indicating a non-translatable input portion as recited in claims 45-51 in substitution for the flag taught by Suzuki in order to provide a user with alternative options for viewing a non-translatable portion in a desired format.

34. **Claims 54-55 and 203-204** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayakawa et al in view of Bernth et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,285,978)*.

With respect to **Claims 54-55 and 203-204**, Kobayakawa discloses the automatic translation system that provides a user with multiple translation display modes, as applied to Claim 1. Kobayakawa does not specifically suggest restoring capitalization and punctuation data in a translation output, however Bernth discloses such a restoring means *(Col. 2, Lines 20-48; and Col. 19, Lines 45-53)*.

Kobayakawa and Bernth are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Kobayakawa with the restoring means taught by Bernth in order to generate an appropriate translated text string *(Bernth, Col. 2, Lines 45-48)*.

Allowable Subject Matter

35. **Claims 34 and 183** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

36. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With respect to **Claims 34 and 183**, the prior art fails to explicitly teach or fairly suggest, either individually or in combination, a method and system for machine translation that provides a user with a presentation option of viewing a translation in a target language with or without a source language text, wherein the method and system also provides for a translation guide having a translation complexity meter that increases based on conjunctions and a number of characters *(character string length)* in a text input *(Specification, Page 40)*.

Although Weisner et al disclose the use of a maximum length indicator based on a number of characters in a translation input *(Col. 3, Lines 46-55)*, Weisner does not teach that incrementing an indicator is additionally based on conjunctions in a text input.

Thus, Claims 34 and 183 contain allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

37. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Cherny *(U.S. Patent: 6,085,162)*- teaches a machine translation system utilizing specialized dictionaries.

Flanagan et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,993,471)*- teaches a network-based translation system.

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached at (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James S. Wozniak
8/30/2006

DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600